| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |
|---|---|--|
|   | 10/088,540  | HOGG ET AL.  |
|   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |
|   | Andrew D. Kosar   | 1654   |
| All Participants:   | Status of Application:  |  |
| (1) <u>Andrew D. Kosar</u> .  | (3)   |  |
| (2) <u>Michael S. Greenfeld</u> .   | (4)   |  |
| Date of Interview: 3 January 2006   | Time: <u>10:00</u>  |  |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:   | cant's representative)  |  |
| Part I.   |   |  |
| Rejection(s) discussed: potential 102(b) rejection of claim 45  |   |  |
| Claims discussed:   |   |  |
| Prior art documents discussed: PTO-1449 Beilstein records, in general   |   |  |
| Part II.  |   |  |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN<br>Applicant's representative was contacted in order to cancel clar<br>Applicant's representative agreed to the amendment.  |   |  |
| Part III.   |   |  |
| <ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not necessary for applicant to provide a separate</li> </ul> | he examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa   | ary by the examiner appears in I                                  | ≺aπ II above.  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
| and O Kom   |   |  |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application   | nt/Applicant's Representative Si                                  | gnature – if appropriate)                                  |